



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/518,051	08/22/1995	STEPHEN D. RUSSELL	74023	8136

7590 10/03/2002

COMMANDING OFFICER
LEGAL COUNSEL FOR PATENTS
NCCOSC RDTE DIV CODE 0012
53510 SILVERGATE AVENUE RM 103
SAN DIEGO, CA 921525765

EXAMINER

MENGISTU, AMARE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

pr4

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/518,051

Applicant(s)
Stephen D. Russell et al

Examiner
AMARE MENGISTU

Art Unit
2673



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (e). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 10, 2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, and 12-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, and 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2774

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CAR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: *“driver interface circuit” of figure 4, mailed on 9/19/97 and “programmable gray-scale LCD 40” filed on 1/22/98* Correction is required.

Specification

2. The amendment filed 1/22/98 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: page 2, lines 1-11. **Programmable gray-scale LCD 40** introduces a new matter into the disclosure.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2774

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,4,12-15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berlin (5,790,297) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Johary et al (5,196,839).

As to claims 1,4,12-15, Berlin discloses a fault tolerant LCD , controller for controlling the gray scale on at least one pixel (col.5, lines 18-22, 49-55) of LCD region and an optical detector (col.5, lines 41-46). Berlin did not disclose in detail the structure of the LCD. However, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art a super twisted noematic liquid crystal display system (figs. 1-3, also see, page 8, the last 2 lines) comprising: a light source (22); a polarizer / an intensity homogenizing (16), a beam of incident light (22), a plurality of liquid crystal display regions coupled (14) to the polarizer; a plurality of pixels of the LCD region, each pixels having a collinear one to one correspondence with a pixel on an adjacent LCD region; an analyzer coupled to the polarizer and the pixel sequence to pass a gray-scale portion of the beam of polarized light transmitted from the pixel sequence as a function of polarized angle (page, 8, lines 6-23), a transparent substrates (12) ; and a drive circuit (18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to combine the use of polarizer with a fault tolerant LCD since this will provide a uniform brightness to the LCD system.

Berlin (as modified by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art) discloses a liquid crystal display with a gray scale control, but has failed to explicitly teach the gray scale control includes a

Art Unit: 2774

programmable driver. Johary is cited to teach that it is well known for a gray scale display circuit to have a programmable gray scale generators (drivers) to provide gray scale at the display (see, Abstract, col.2, lines 35-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated programmable gray-scale drives of Johary into the system of Berlin, since this will allow the Berlin device to have an advantage of automatically control the gray scale of a display in order to ensure simplicity and higher efficiency of adjustment operation without requiring operators.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 16 and 17 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,12-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Amare Mengistu at telephone number (703) 305-4880.

8. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Serial Number: 08/518.051

Page 5

Art Unit: 2774

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

A.M

Art Unit 2673

Sep.29,2002


Amare Mengistu
Primary Examiner